<u>REMARKS</u>

In response to the Office Action mailed on April 07, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-53 are pending in this Application.

<u>Claim Objections</u>

The Examiner has objected to informalities in claim 25-35. Applicants have amended claim 25 to provide further clarification and expedite subsequent prosecution.

With respect to claim 25, the Examiner has objected to the term "coman agent" and believes it should read – comman agent or common agent. Though Applicants traverse the Examiner's objection and reverses the right to argue patentability of the claim in its original form at a later time, Applicants have amended claim 25 to provide clarification and expedite further prosecution. Amended claim 25 recites, "…..comprising an agent for detecting…..."

Applicants submit that the claim element is clear after amendment and therefore requests reconsideration of Examiner's objection by virtue of dependency. These editorial amendments are not made to distinguish any prior art, nor to limit claim scope in any fashion, or for reasons of patentability as contemplated in *Festo* and its progeny.

<u>Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b)</u>

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18, 20-26, 30-36, 40-46 and 48-53 under 35 U.S.C § 102 as being anticipated by Houston (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0019945; herein after referred to as "Houston"). Applicants believe that the rejected claims are allowable over the art of record based on the differences set forth in the following comments between Houston and the invention as claimed.

The applicants comment below show that Houston does not anticipate the invention as claimed.

With respect to independent claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the present invention uses methods and systems that capture usage data from one or more user computers. The usage data is processed and analyzed for managing security of the user's computer.

Furthermore, the captured data may assist in enterprise management by monitoring computer usage in a work environment.

Houston discloses collection of the security event data from a plurality of security devices placed in a distributed computing environment. Subsequently, the gathered security data is stored and analyzed in order to facilitate management of the security for a relatively large computing network. Additionally, in Para [0041] and [0042] Houston describes a process of monitoring network security. The network has numerous security devices installed or embedded throughout. Thereafter, an event manager that collects security event data from the security devices further facilitates the management of large security event data.

In this context, Houston teaches the management and collection of security data from one or more security devices over the distributed network. This is different from collection of events from a user's computer corresponding to user's interaction with the computer. Further, the present invention describes 'event' as the usage data that may relate to software application, a keystroke, mouse input, a smart pen, a touch of a screen, input from a device such as a joystick, an identifier of the user or any other similar events, inputs or devices. In short, the usage data collected from user's interaction as recited in claim 1, is altogether different from the security data collected by security devices as disclosed by Houston. Therefore, Houston fails to teach or suggest "events that correspond to user interactions with computers connected to a network of the enterprise" as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Although independent claims 10, 18, 25, 36, 46 and 53 have a different scope from independent claim 1, claim 10, 18, 25, 36, 46 and 53 also recite "events that correspond to user interactions with computers connected to a network of the enterprise." Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 10, 18, 25, 36, 46 and 53 are not anticipated by Houston for at least similar reasons to those discussed above detailing Houston's deficiencies with regard to independent claim 1.

Applicants further submit that claims 2-9, 11-17, 19-24, 26-35 and 47-52 dependent upon independent claims 10, 18, 25, 36, 46 and 53 respectively, are also patentably distinct from Houston for at least similar reasons to those discussed above; in particular with regard to

independent claims 10, 18, 25, 36, 46 and 53. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this basis of the Examiner's rejection for these claims as well.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103 (a)

The examiner rejected claims 3, 11, 19, 27-29, 37-39 and 47 which are dependent on claims 1,10, 18, 25 and 46 under 35 U.S.C §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Houston further in view of Nguyen et al (U.S. 2004/0064731) herein after referred as "Nguyen."

Dependent Claims

Rejection of claim 3, 11, 19, 27-29, 37 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully submit that combining Houston with Nguyen does not suggest, teach or make obvious the inventions claimed in dependent claims 3, 11, 19, 27-29, 37-39 and 47.

Nyugen describes a process of limiting access to the report based on a predetermined level of authority of the party seeking access. However, Nyugen describes the process of limiting access to the report generated over an information security and thereby limiting intruders from gaining access to a computer network. Therefore, Nyugen fails to teach limiting access to the report generated for the data collected in context to user and its interaction with the computer over a network. Thus, even considered in combination with Houston, Nyugen still fails to recite all elements of each claim.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 3, 11, 19, 27-29, 37 and 47 as being unpatentable over Houston in view of Nguyen is respectfully traversed and reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested at this time.

The other references of record have been reviewed and applicants' invention is deemed patentably distinct and non obvious over both Houston and Nguyen taken alone or in combination.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above

may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

<u>Summary</u>

Applicants believe that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

The director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4262 in order to have this paper considered.

Respectfully submitted,

STRATEGIC PATENTS, P.C.

<u>/Robert Mazzarese/</u>
Robert A. Mazzarese
Reg. No. 42,852
(781) 453-9993

Customer Number 43520